

REMARKS

Claims 1-68 were presented for examination and are pending in this application. In an Office Action dated November 16, 2007, claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-68 were rejected; claims 6-11 were objected to, and claims 15-21 were allowed. Applicant has amended claims 2-4, 25-26 and 54-55, reviewed the office action and the cited reference, and respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-68.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 2 the office action, the Examiner indicated that claims 16 to 21 were allowed. Examiner also indicated that claims 6-11 would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for review of these claims.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1

On page 2 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner contends that the claims recite "security identifiers" which are not disclosed in the instant specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses this rejection. Support for the term "identifier" and its usage and recognition can be found in paragraph [0043] of the specification. However to avoid any confusion and ambiguity, the applicant has amended claims 2-4 and 25-26 to replace the term "security identifiers" with --identifiers--. Applicant submits that with these amendments to claims 2-4 and 25-26, these

claims comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph be withdrawn

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Arteaga et al., U.S. Publication Number 2002/0161826 (hereafter “Arteaga”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-68.

The Examiner contends regarding Claims 1 and 23 that Arteaga teaches and describes receiving a SOAP message; determining whether at least one security rule has been defined for the SOAP message, the at least one security rule being defined based on a security policy for exchanging SOAP messages between at least one client program and at least one server program, and performing at least one security related operation on the SOAP message based on the at least one security rule when the determining determines that at least one security rule is associated with the SOAP message (paragraph [0092 – 0095]). The Examiner cites the same paragraphs of Arteaga in rejecting claim 27.

Applicants disagree that there is any such teaching in Arteaga, especially in the paragraphs cited by the Examiner.

Claim 1 recites in relevant part:

. . . .

determining whether at least one **security rule has been defined for the SOAP message**, the at least one security rule being defined based on a security policy for exchanging SOAP messages between at least one client program and at least one server program; and performing at least one security related **operation on the SOAP message based on the at least one security rule** when the determining determines that at least one security rule is associated with the SOAP message.

. . . .[Emphasis added.]

Claim 27 recites in relevant part:

determining whether at least one **rule is associated with the SOAP message**;

. . . .

evaluating the at least one rule at least partially based on the collected data; and

. . . .[Emphasis added.]

Independent claims 23, 33, 38, 39, 52, 53, 56, 65 and 66 all include similar limitations of determining [a] rule, and performing [the] rule or evaluating

Applicant submits that these claimed steps of determining whether there is a rule for the SOAP message and performing or evaluating the rule on the SOAP message for security purposes is advantageous because it allows security to be set up on a per SOAP message basis. The steps of determining whether there is a rule for the SOAP message and performing or evaluating the rule on the SOAP message for security purposes are not disclosed, taught or

suggested by Arteaga. There is no mention whatsoever anywhere in Arteaga of assigning or defining rules for SOAP messages or performing or evaluating the rule for security of SOAP messages. There is simply no such disclosure, teaching or suggestion of such in Arteaga.

The Examiner contends that the claimed features are disclosed in Arteaga at paragraphs [0092 – 0095]. Applicant has reviewed paragraphs [0092 – 0095] of Arteaga and yet they say nothing about security or disclose in any way the language of the claims noted above. Rather, these paragraphs disclose how version control is implemented and do not relate to security at all. These paragraphs mention SOAP in passing as a “version control SOAP request” (see Paragraph [0093]) and a SOAP object call (see Paragraph [0095]). But these are all in the context of version control and NOT security. Version control is not the same as security. Version control as stated in the beginning of paragraph [0092] is about the “process of updating the applications that have been deployed to the client devices.” Clearly, this is not the same as message security.

In rejecting the other claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) the Examiner also cites paragraphs [0107, 0108, 0120, 0099, 0157, 0102, 0099 and 0103] of Arteaga. Again, none of these paragraphs disclose anything even remotely close to the claim language of claims 1, 23 or 27. For example, paragraphs [0099 and 0102] are about synchronization not security; paragraph [0107] is about authentication not security; paragraph [0120] is about deployment packages and Cabinet files, and not security; and paragraph [0157] is about SOAP envelopes and not security. While paragraphs [0103 and 0108] discuss a security controller 230 of Arteaga, this security controller 220 is for the entire system. It does not relate to security for SOAP messages, and more importantly, fails to disclose the claimed steps of claims 1, 23 and 27 of determining whether there is a rule for the SOAP message and performing or evaluating the rule on the SOAP

message for security purposes. Thus, Applicants strongly disagree with the Examiner and believe that claims 1, 23 and 27 are patentably distinct over Arteaga.

Independent claims 33, 38, 39, 52, 53, 56, 65 and 66 include limitations similar to claims 1, 23 and 27; and therefore, are likewise believed to be patentable over Arteaga. Each of these claims includes the determining of a rule and a performing or evaluating step but in related security contexts. For example, claim 38 also recites service attacks, claims 39 and 53 also recites controlling publication, claim 52 also recites granting access, and claims 56, 65 and 66 also recite taking an action.

Claims 2-15, 22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-37, 40-51, 54, 55, 57-64 and 67-68 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 23, 27, 33, 39, 53, 56 and 66 and therefore, include the limitations similar to claim 1. Claims 54 and 55 have been amendment to depend from claims 53. Additionally, claims 2-15, 22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-37, 40-51, 54, 55, 57-64 and 67-68 recite other patentable distinctions. For example, claim 2-4 further recite the use of identifiers, claim 5 specifies looking up rules associated with message type, claim 29 includes determining a portion of history to be collected, etc. Thus, claims 2-15, 22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-37, 40-51, 54, 55, 57-64 and 67-68 are likewise believed to be patentable over the cited art based both on the their dependence on a patentably distinct independent claim and the other patent distinctions they recite.

Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-68 are patentably distinct over the art of record and respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-68.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons given above, while not necessarily conceding any contention not specifically addressed. Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of and objections to these claims and request allowance of the claims.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicant's attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kerry Champion

Date: February 11, 2008

By: /Greg T. Sueoka/
Greg T. Sueoka, Reg. No. 33,800
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel: (650) 335-7194
Fax: (650) 938-5200

23982/11569/DOCS/1853868.2